

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No. 10/784,088	Applicant(s) SKIBA, JEFFRY B.
Examiner JESSICA REIDEL		Art Unit 3766	

All Participants:

(1) JESSICA REIDEL.

(2) Lowell W. Gresham.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:30 PM

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed: _____

Claims discussed: _____

10, 11, 14, 18

Prior art documents discussed: _____

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Carl H. Layno/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3766

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner reminded Applicant that during patent examination, pending claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. Accordingly, recitations of "apparatus" and "article", as recited in the pending claims of the instant application, may be interpreted extremely broad and an apparatus comprising an article having the specified dissimilar conductive electrode pattern of the claims may be anticipated by or unpatentable over a wide variety of conductive articles or products of manufacture. In effort to expedite prosecution of the instant Application, the Examiner proposed changes be made to Claims 10, 11, 14 and 18 via Examiner's Amendment in order to ensure that the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention (as it is described within the originally filed disclosure) is particularly pointed out and distinctly defined by the claims. Applicant agreed.